

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Omar Martin v. Knight, et al.

Martin v. Knight · No. 1:22-cv-01582-KES-BAM (PC) · Decided September 17, 2025

OPINION

Knight

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 OMAR MARTIN, Case No. 1:22-cv-01582-KES-BAM (PC) 12 Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO

DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO

13 v. PROSECUTE

14 KNIGHT, et al., FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE

15 Defendants. 16

17 I. Background 18 Plaintiff Omar Martin (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and
in forma 19 pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds
on 20 Plaintiff’s first amended complaint against Defendant Knight for deliberate indifference to a
21 medical need for the incident on April 10, 2020, in violation of the Eighth Amendment. 22 On
January 26, 2024, Defendant Knight filed a motion for summary on the ground that 23 Plaintiff
failed to exhaust administrative remedies prior to filing suit. (ECF No. 40.) On June 17, 24 2025,
the Court issued findings and recommendations that recommended denial of Defendant 25
Knight’s motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 48.) The findings and recommendations 26
served on Plaintiff were returned as “Undeliverable, Return to Sender, Not Deliverable as 27
Addressed, Unable to Forward” on June 25, 2025. Plaintiff’s notice of change of address was 28
therefore due on or before July 25, 2025. Local Rule 183(b). Plaintiff has not filed a notice of 1
change of address or otherwise communicated with the Court. 2 On September 15, 2025, the
District Judge adopted the findings and recommendations and 3 denied Defendant Knight’s
motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 49.) 4 II. Discussion 5 Plaintiff is required to keep the
Court apprised of his current address at all times. Local

6 Rule 183(b) provides:

7 Address Changes. A party appearing in propria persona shall keep the Court and 8 opposing
parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a plaintiff in propria persona by
the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, 9 and if such plaintiff fails to notify the Court and

opposing parties within thirty

(30) days thereafter of a current address, the Court may dismiss the action without

10 prejudice for failure to prosecute. 11 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) also provides for dismissal of an action for failure to 12 prosecute.¹³ As noted, Plaintiff's address change was due no later than July 25, 2025. Plaintiff has 14 failed to file a change of address, and he has not otherwise been in contact with the Court. 15 "In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, the district court is 16 required to weigh several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; 17 (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public 18 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic 19 sanctions." *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988) (internal quotation marks and 20 citation omitted); accord *Omstead v. Dell, Inc.*, 594 F.3d 1081, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010); *In re 21 Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006). 22 These factors guide a court in deciding what to do and are not conditions that must be met in 23 order for a court to take action. *In re PPA*, 460 F.3d at 1226 (citation omitted). 24 Given Plaintiff's failure to update his address or communicate with the Court, the 25 expeditious resolution of litigation and the Court's need to manage its docket weigh in favor of 26 dismissal. *In re PPA*, 460 F.3d at 1227. More importantly, given the Court's apparent inability 27 1 Courts may dismiss actions sua sponte under Rule 41(b) based on the plaintiff's failure to prosecute. 28 *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U. S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (citation omitted). 1 to communicate with Plaintiff, there are no other reasonable alternatives available to address 2 Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action and his failure to apprise the Court of his current 3 address. *Id.* at 1228–29; *Carey*, 856 F.2d at 1441. The Court will therefore recommend that this 4 action be dismissed based on Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action. 5 III. Conclusion and Recommendation 6 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, without 7 prejudice, based on Plaintiff's failure to prosecute. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rule 183(b). 8 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District 9 Judge assigned to the case, under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen (14) 10 days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, the parties may file written 11 objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's 12 Findings and Recommendations." Objections, if any, shall not exceed fifteen (15) pages or 13 include exhibits. Exhibits may be referenced by document and page number if already in 14 the record before the Court. Any pages filed in excess of the 15-page limit may not be 15 considered. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may 16 result in the waiver of the "right to challenge the magistrate's factual findings" on 17 appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 18 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 21 Dated: September 17, 2025 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe _

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/omar-martin-v-knight-et-al-y3md8s00>